

Appl. No. 10/711,181  
Amdt. dated April 17, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 6, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### I. Rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacInnis (US 6,573,905) in view of Jackson (US 5,544,202).

5

#### Response:

The applicant would like to point out the patentable differences between independent claims 1 and 12 and the prior art combination of MacInnis and Jackson. Independent claims 1 and 12 specify that the first clock generator provides "the same clock having the  
10 same frequency and the same phase to the video capture engine and the video display engine so as to synchronize the signal receiving rates of the video capture engine and the video display engine." That is, the same exact clock is provided to both the video capture engine and the video display engine.

15 On the other hand, MacInnis teaches a way of synchronizing two clocks, but does not teach that the same clock with the same frequency and phase should be input to both the video capture engine and the video display engine.

In addition, Jackson teaches in column 1, lines 10-19, using "a phase-locked loop for  
20 locking the output frequency of an oscillator to that of an independently produced input signal". In other words, Jackson teaches synchronizing an output signal with an input signal, but does not teach "providing the same clock having the same frequency and the same phase to the video capture engine and the video display engine" as is recited in independent claims 1 and 12. Providing the same clock to two devices ensures that the  
25 clocks used for the two devices will have the same frequency and the same phase. However, using a PLL to synchronize an output signal with an input signal does not necessarily ensure that the output signal is exactly the same as the input signal.

Appl. No. 10/711,181  
Amdt. dated April 17, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 6, 2006

Furthermore, both of the independent claims 1 and 12 recite "a memory connected to the video capture engine for storing the digital signal captured by the video capture engine". On the other hand, MacInnis does not teach a memory directly connected to the video capture engine for storing digital video signals captured by the video capture engine. Thus, the combination of MacInnis and Jackson fails to teach this limitation.

Moreover, regarding the rejection of claims 12-22, each of these claims is rejected using a combination of three or four patent references. The large number of references relied upon is further evidence of the non-obviousness of these rejections. One skilled in the art would not have motivation to combine these large number of references for producing the claimed invention.

For these reasons, the cited prior art fails to teach all limitations contained in claims 1 and 12, and claim 1 is patentable over the combination of MacInnis and Jackson and claim 12 is patentable over the combination of MacInnis, Kim, and Jackson. Claims 2-11 and 13-22 are dependent on claims 1 and 12, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 12 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-22 is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/711,181  
Amdt. dated April 17, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 6, 2006

Sincerely yours,



Date: 04.17.2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)